



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/849,056 | 05/20/2004 | Ryosuke Inagaki | KY-202 | 6741 |

7590 08/15/2008
MATTINGLY, STANGER & MALUR, P.C.
Suite 370
1800 Diagonal Road
Alexandria, VA 22314

| |
|----------|
| EXAMINER |
|----------|

SUTHERS, DOUGLAS JOHN

| | |
|----------|--------------|
| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|

2615

| | |
|-----------|---------------|
| MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
|-----------|---------------|

08/15/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| | | | |
|------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|--|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
| | 10/849,056 | INAGAKI, RYOSUKE | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Douglas J. Suthers | 2615 | |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 May 2008.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1,4-6 and 9-12 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1,4-6 and 9-12 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 20 May 2004 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

| | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ . |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>5/9/08</u> . | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

djs

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1, 4-6 and 9-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1 recites the limitation "the mute signal" in line 5. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. Claims 4, 6, and 9 are rejected in an analogous manner.

Claim 1 recites the limitation "the output signal" in line 6. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 1 recites the limitation "the inverted output signal" in line 7. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 5 ends "the mute" with no period ending the claim. It is unclear what is being claimed.

Claim 4 states "the output signal of the first output stage amplifier is output a terminal". This should most likely read: "the output signal of the first output stage amplifier is output to a terminal".

Claim 4 states “the output signal of the second output stage amplifier is output another terminal”. This should most likely read: “the output signal of the second output stage amplifier is output to another terminal”.

Claim 4 states “is an operational amplifier of which output stage”. This should most likely read: “is an operational amplifier of which an output stage”.

Claim 6 recites the limitation “the power source”. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 9 states “the output signal of the first output stage amplifier is output a terminal”. This should most likely read: “the output signal of the first output stage amplifier is output to a terminal”.

Claim 9 states “the output signal of the second output stage amplifier is output another terminal”. This should most likely read: “the output signal of the second output stage amplifier is output to another terminal”.

Claims 10-12 are rejected as being dependent on claim 9.

Claim 12 recites the limitation “the second switch circuits ”. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and

the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 2, 4-6, and 9-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Heithoff (US 6346854 B1) in view of Ishida (US 2002/0075072 A1).

Regarding claim 1, Heithoff discloses a mute circuit in a BTL circuit formed in an IC which drives a speaker (figure 2, item 114) by a first output stage amplifier (116) and a second output stage amplifier (124) which generates an inverted output signal with respect to an output signal of the first output stage amplifier, comprising;

a mute signal generation circuit (as described in column 4 lines 12-37) for generating the mute signal (CSD) and a switch circuit (142);

wherein the second output stage amplifier receives the output signal of the first output stage amplifier (117) as an input and generates the inverted output signal, the switch circuit (142) is provided, wherein the second output stage amplifier receives the output signal of the first output stage amplifier via a resistor (126), and the switch circuit is an analog switch (142, column 5 lines 18-25).

Heithoff does not expressly disclose the claimed switching position.

Ishida discloses wherein a switch circuit is provided between any one of the outputs of a first and second output stage amplifier (figure 1, items 5 and 9) and a terminal of the speaker and through a mute signal (12) the switch circuit is turned OFF for a predetermined interval to effect muting (paragraph [0012]), wherein the mute signal is a pulse signal having a predetermined width which is generated when a power

source is turned ON or OFF, the mute signal generation circuit is a one shot circuit and the one shot circuit generates the pulse in response to a turning ON signal of the power source (required from item 12 figure 2, to items 5 and 9 according to paragraph [0012]).

Although Ishida does not expressly disclose the pulse width period, it would have been an obvious design choice to have it be a pulse width of less than a few tens of milliseconds. The motivation to do so would have been to allow for enough time for circuits to stabilize, yet not overly delaying operation. Therefore at the time of invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to further comprise a mute signal having a pulse width of less than a few tens of milliseconds.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the switching of Ishida in the system of Heithoff. The motivation for doing so would have been cut off current to the speaker from the power amps in a more direct manner, insuring no sound is heard. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Ishida with Heithoff to obtain the invention as specified in claim 1.

Regarding claim 4, Heithoff discloses a mute circuit in a BTL circuit formed in an IC which drives a speaker (figure 2, item 114) by a first output stage amplifier (116) and a second output stage amplifier (124) which generates an inverted output signal with respect to an output signal of the first output stage amplifier, comprising:

a mute signal generation circuit (as described in column 4 lines 12-37) for generating the mute signal (CSD) and a first switch circuit (142);

wherein the second output stage amplifier receives the output signal of the first output stage amplifier (117) as an input and generates the inverted output signal, the output signal of the first output stage amplifier is output a terminal (VOUT-) of the speaker, the output signal of the second output stage amplifier is output another terminal (VOUT+) of the speaker, and through the mute signal the switch circuit is turned OFF for a predetermined interval to effect muting (column 4 lines 12-50) and wherein each of the first and second output stage amplifier is an operational amplifier (116 and 124).

Heithoff does not expressly disclose the claimed switching.

Ishida discloses output stages each of which output stage is constituted by a push-pull structured transistors (2a-2d), and a switch circuit is constituted through turning OFF the respective transistors of one of the first output stage amplifier and the second output stage amplifier for a predetermined interval by a mute signal and an output of the one of the first output stage amplifier and the second output stage amplifier is set at a high impedance (paragraph [0031]).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the switching of Ishida in the system of Heithoff. The motivation for doing so would have been cut off current to the speaker from the power amps in a more direct manner, insuring no sound is heard. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Ishida with Heithoff to obtain the invention as specified in claim 4.

Regarding claim 6, Heithoff discloses a BTL audio amplifier apparatus formed in an IC which drives a speaker (figure 2, item 114) by a first output stage amplifier (116) and a second output stage amplifier (124) which output stage amplifier which generates an inverted output signal with respect to an output signal of the first output stage amplifier, comprising:

a mute signal generation circuit (as described in column 4 lines 12-37) for generating the mute signal (CSD) and a first switch circuit (142);

wherein the second output stage amplifier receives the output signal of the first output stage amplifier (117) as an input and generates the inverted output signal, through the mute signal the first switch circuit is turned OFF for a predetermined interval to effect muting (column 4 lines 12-50), wherein the second output stake amplifier receives the output signal of the first output stage amplifier via a resistor (126), the first switch circuit is an analog switch (142, column 5 lines 18-25).

Heithoff does not expressly disclose the claimed switching position.

Ishida discloses the first switch circuit is provided between any one of the outputs of the first and second output stage amplifier (figure 1, items 5 and 9) and a terminal of the speaker and the mute signal is a pulse signal having a predetermined width which is generated when a power source is turned ON or OFF, the mute signal generation circuit is a one shot circuit and the one shot circuit generates the pulse signal in response to a turning ON signal of the power source (required from item 12 figure 2, to items 5 and 9 according to paragraph [0012]).

Although Ishida does not expressly disclose the pulse width period, it would have been an obvious design choice to have it be a pulse width of less than a few tens of milliseconds. The motivation to do so would have been to allow for enough time for circuits to stabilize, yet not overly delaying operation. Therefore at the time of invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to further comprise a mute signal having a pulse width of less than a few tens of milliseconds

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the switching of Ishida in the system of Heithoff. The motivation for doing so would have been cut off current to the speaker from the power amps in a more direct manner, insuring no sound is heard. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Ishida with Heithoff to obtain the invention as specified in claim 6.

Regarding claim 9, Heithoff discloses a BTL audio amplifier apparatus formed in an IC which drives a speaker (figure 2, item 114) by a first output stage amplifier (116) and a second output stage amplifier (124) which generates an inverted output signal with respect to an output signal of the first output stage amplifier, comprising:

a mute signal generation circuit (as described in column 4 lines 12-37) for generating the mute signal (CSD) and a first switch circuit (142);

wherein the second output stage amplifier receives the output signal of the first output stage amplifier (117) as an input and generates the inverted output signal, the output signal of the first output stage amplifier is output a terminal of the speaker

(VOUT-), the output signal of the second output stage amplifier is output another terminal of the speaker (VOUT+), and through the mute signal the switch circuit is turned OFF for a predetermined interval to effect muting (column 4 lines 12-50) .

Heithoff does not expressly disclose the claimed switching.

Ishida discloses output stages each of which output stage is constituted by a push-pull structured transistors (2a-2d), and a switch circuit is constituted through turning OFF the respective transistors of one of the first output stage amplifier and the second output stage amplifier for a predetermined interval by a mute signal and an output of the one of the first output stage amplifier and the second output stage amplifier is set at a high impedance (paragraph [0031]).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the switching of Ishida in the system of Heithoff. The motivation for doing so would have been cut off current to the speaker from the power amps in a more direct manner, insuring no sound is heard. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Ishida with Heithoff to obtain the invention as specified in claim 9.

Regarding claim 10, Heithoff discloses wherein the second output stage amplifier receives the output signal of the first output stage amplifier via a resistor (126), the switch circuit is an analog switch (142, column 5 lines 18-25) and the mute signal is a pulse signal having a predetermined width which is generated when a power source is turned ON or OFF (column 4 lines 12-50).

Regarding claim 11, Ishida discloses further comprising a plurality of second switch circuits (figure 3, items 20a-20d) provided in any one of the first and second output stage amplifier, wherein the respective first and second output stage amplifier are provided with a plurality of drive circuits for driving the respective transistors, and through interrupting operation currents of the plurality of drive circuits upon receiving the mute signal by the plurality of the second switch circuits and through turning OFF the transistors, any one of the outputs of the first and second output stage amplifier is set at a high impedance (paragraph [0030]).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to all claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Douglas J. Suthers whose telephone number is (571)272-0563. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8am - 5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vivian Chin can be reached on (571)272-7848. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Application/Control Number:
10/849,056
Art Unit: 2615

Page 12

/Douglas J Suthers/
Examiner, Art Unit 2615

/Vivian Chin/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2615